

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-25 are amended for improved clarity and to correct for antecedent basis. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts there is insufficient basis for the claim phrase "the left and right target regions." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 16, 18, 20, 22 and 24 have been amended to provide antecedent basis for the target regions. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0232510 to Blake et al. ("Blake"). Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Blake in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0089212 to Mashitani et al. ("Mashitani"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Using independent claim 1 for illustrative purposes, claim 1 recites a method for generating a stereoscopic image having a left image and a right image for stereoscopic vision. The stereoscopic image of claim 1 contains both a right and a left image. In other words, the final product (the stereoscopic image) is two images, modified in such a manner as to allow a

user, when perceiving both together to see a single three dimensional image. The remaining independent claims recite the same feature. By contrast, Blake discloses a system for creating a single image, from input from two cameras. See [0028] of Blake. Thus, Blake does not disclose generating two images as recited in claim 1.

In Blake, the problem relates to allowing a user in, for example, a teleconference to be seen as staring straight into a camera, even when the camera may be positioned off axis from the person. See [0025] of Blake. Blake discloses a solution, in which two cameras both provide images of the person. Blake then disclose synthesizing these images into a single image (the virtual image 116). See [0028] of Blake, stating "it should be understood that cyclopean refers to the single virtual image" (emphasis added). In other words, the person viewing the image of Blake views a single image or the user through, for example, a TV screen. The system of Blake is not concerned, excessively, with preserving the three dimensional accuracy of objects in the background behind the camera subject. Rather the focus of Blake is to make it appear as if the subject is staring at a camera straight ahead.

By contrast, the current application deals with the creation of a stereoscopic image, formed of two independent images. The background section explains that in older stereoscopic images the brain suffered from binocular effect because it would remain cognizant that it was viewing two images. See [0007]-[0008] of Applicant's specification. As such, the method of claim 1 is concerned with avoiding such problems extracting a more inconspicuous region, and then processing the two images.

In summary, Blake generates one image, while claim 1 generates two images. As such, Blake does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1.

Furthermore, it would not be obvious to modify Blake to create two images. Blake has no interest in keeping the two images it creates as separate images. To the contrary, Blake explicitly states that it desires to create a single image that can be projected on, for

example, a teleconference screen. Thus, it would also not be obvious to modify Blake to disclose the method of claim 1, or the other independent claims.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4-25 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Moshe K. Wilensky  
Registration No. 56,263

JAO:MKW/jfb

Date: April 23, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--